

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, Sunday is National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day, a day to bring attention to a disorder that affects countless of my fellow veterans.

PTSD is a disorder that tens of thousands of Americans are diagnosed with every year. Sadly, our veterans and Active Duty servicemembers are among those that face the toughest challenge.

As a 24-year Army veteran, and as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I was proud to work together with my colleagues across the aisle in addressing PTSD by introducing two pieces of legislation to help veterans get the mental healthcare they both deserve and need. The Sgt. Ketchum Rural Veterans Mental Health Act will expand VA mental healthcare for veterans in rural areas. It passed the House last month and unanimously passed the Senate last night.

I am now proud to cosponsor the recently reintroduced Brandon Act, which will make it easier for veterans and servicemembers to seek confidential mental health resources.

We, as Members of Congress, have the ability to take action, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the mental health of our veterans and our servicemembers through passing the Brandon Act.

□ 0915

#### AMERICA SHOULD REDUCE DEPENDENCY ON CHINA

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, China, led by the Chinese Communist Party, has inflicted more damage and suffering on the world and even its own people than is even calculable.

Accountability for its action, or timely inactions, on the Wuhan virus is necessary. Transparency in how research labs conduct business is essential in holding those responsible that allowed the leak of extremely dangerous byproducts that have cost multitudes of lives and inflicted many trillions in economic harm upon the world.

The U.S. must zero out its dependence on China for so much of what we use and need in everyday life. We must produce our own pharmaceutical products, our own rare-earth products from our own mines, our own manufacturing.

We must prohibit the gain-of-function research that likely led to the Wuhan virus being unleashed on the world.

Overhaul the World Health Organization and our relationship with it.

Prohibit National Institutes of Health funding to those who don't have the United States and American peoples' best interests and wellness at heart.

Reimpose visa sanctions on China.

And, certainly, why give China a legitimate stage to the world via the Olympics?

The Olympics rightly should be rebid and moved in time for 2022 to countries that respect and revere human rights and right to basic freedoms from oppression. Otherwise, we give it all a green light and a tacit stamp of approval.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRON- MENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "OIL AND NAT- URAL GAS SECTOR: EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW, RECON- STRUCTED, AND MODIFIED SOURCES REVIEW"

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 486, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 14) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

#### S.J. RES. 14

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review" (85 Fed. Reg. 57018 (September 14, 2020)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 14.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are here to consider S.J. Res. 14, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the Environmental Protection Agency's 2020 methane rescission rule. This Trump EPA action removed direct Federal limits on methane pollution from new and modified oil and gas facilities, essentially increasing pollution and exacerbating the climate crisis.

While we are voting on the Senate version of this joint resolution today, I want to thank my colleagues, Representatives DEGETTE, PETERS, and LAMB, for leading this effort in the House. The House version of this resolution advanced out of the Energy and Commerce Committee earlier this month.

Mr. Speaker, methane is a potent climate-disrupting greenhouse gas that is responsible for approximately one-third of our warming and resulting climate disruption. Addressing methane is an urgent and essential step to mitigate climate change.

The greatest and most cost-effective way to curb methane pollution over the next decade is through the fossil fuel sector, which is the largest industrial source of methane emissions in the United States.

Under the Clean Air Act, the EPA has a responsibility and obligation to protect public health and welfare from dangerous climate pollution like methane. But because of the Trump rescission rule, there are now no clean air protections in place to curb dangerous methane pollution from the oil and gas sector.

What is more, the Trump rule created massive regulatory loopholes that shield the vast majority of climate pollution produced by the oil and gas industry from critical Federal standards for years to come.

The Trump action was a thinly veiled attempt to block regulation of the worst oil and gas industry actors at the expense of our health, our safety, and our planet; and it came at a time when we need these protections more than ever.

Mr. Speaker, without bold action to curb emissions from the hundreds of thousands of sources in the oil and gas sector, methane pollution will continue to cause significant harm to public health, threaten the stability of our economy, and compromise the well-being of future generations and the planet.

That is why this joint resolution disapproving of the rescission rule and reinstating the 2016 Obama-era methane standards is so important.

Ambitiously addressing methane can yield tremendous climate, public health, and financial benefits across the country. It is why we see an outpouring of support from business and consumer groups, State and Tribal officials, local government officials, outdoor recreation and tourism leaders, environmental and conservation groups, and health and faith leaders. We even have significant support from within the oil and gas industry itself.

So, today, we are using the Congressional Review Act to soundly reject and nullify one of the most egregious environmental rollbacks of the Trump administration.

With today's vote, Congress stops the significant retreat we witnessed during the previous administration in the fight against climate change, and we reinstate an essential tool for addressing the harm a warming world means for our communities, our health, our economy, and the planet.

With today's vote, Congress restores the robust Clean Air Act pollution standards established in 2012 and 2016, while clearing a path for stronger protections in the future.

With today's vote, Mr. Speaker, Congress recognizes the danger methane poses, as well as the economic opportunity and certainty created with commonsense and cost-effective limits on this pollution.

Since the Senate already passed S.J. Res. 14 with a bipartisan vote of 52-42, it is now up to the House to do the same so we can send this resolution to the President's desk.

For the sake of our communities, our families, our country, and our future, I strongly urge all Members to join me in supporting this joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution of disapproval of the EPA's methane policy rule.

This resolution is another attack on the hardworking American men and women who supply energy that is so important to our economy and our national security.

Don't be mistaken, this is an attack on American energy security.

Remember those gas lines from the 1970s? Remember the energy security and dominance truly captured in the last few years?

In 2020, America became energy independent. It was a longtime goal. President Jimmy Carter established the Department of Energy with a goal of becoming energy independent, recognizing how important a diverse supply of energy is to America.

So why is the majority moving forward right now?

Gas prices are already on the rise, threatening our economic recovery and causing pain at the pump for Americans who are ready to put the pandemic behind them.

We are still recovering from the Colonial Pipeline cyberattack, which shut down the Nation's most important pipeline, causing supply shortages and price spikes.

If it is not already obvious to the Democrats across the aisle, affordable and reliable supplies of gasoline are absolutely critical to our economy. It is critical to our way of life.

This is a misguided resolution. Taken together with President Biden's execu-

tive orders banning oil and natural gas drilling on Federal lands and canceling the Keystone XL pipeline, it will likely drive gas prices even higher.

So why is the majority pushing this resolution?

This resolution has next to nothing to do with protecting the environment or reducing methane emissions. The States and the EPA already regulate methane emissions, and we have a well-established program that supports the industry to go even further.

Reducing methane emissions is a priority for all of us, for the oil and natural gas industry; and thanks to innovation and industry action, the United States methane emissions rates in the largest producing regions have declined 70 percent in the last decade, even as our production is surging.

The United States is the world's leading producers of oil and natural gas. That is something that we should be celebrating. That is so foundational to our economy, to our national security.

In addition to that, we are leading the world in emission reductions at the same time. The United States of America has led the world in reducing carbon emissions, more than the next 12 countries combined, more than any other country in the world.

Again, that is something that we should be celebrating. Let's not jeopardize that progress to fulfill the Green New Deal wish list.

We all know that this resolution is unnecessary. President Biden has made his intentions very clear. His administration has declared war on affordable fossil energy and energy security. President Biden has already canceled the Keystone pipeline and banned drilling on Federal lands. Now Democrats are proposing this resolution to clear the pathway for President Biden and the EPA to impose burdensome new regulations on the energy industry.

This is just the tip of the iceberg to regulate other sources under section 111 of the Clean Air Act, regardless of their overall contribution to air pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit we should be focusing on results, not on feel-good measures. This is an attack on American energy.

Who is next?

The EPA has its crosshairs on the backbone of American industry, including manufacturing, paper, chemicals, plastics, and metals. Millions of good-paying American jobs are on the line. Our competitiveness is on the line. American leadership is on the line. Our national security is on the line.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this harmful resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), your neighbor and the prime sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, along with Mr. PETERS and Mr. LAMB, I am

very proud to stand as the sponsor of the House companion of S.J. Res. 14, and I rise in strong support of the legislation.

The purpose of the legislation is very simple. It is to reduce our methane emissions and to help stave off the worst effects of the climate crisis before it is too late.

Methane, as we all know, is one of the most potent greenhouse gases on the planet, and when it is released into our atmosphere, it becomes a leading contributor to global warming.

Climate experts agree that one of the most important things we can do right now to combat the climate crisis is to reduce the amount of methane in our atmosphere, and that is exactly what this legislation does.

It restores the 2016 methane emission rules that were put in place during the Obama administration, and it negates the Trump administration's last-minute attempt to roll back these rules on its way out the door.

One-third of all of the methane that is released in this country comes from the production of oil and gas.

This legislation will, once again, require our oil and gas producers to take the steps needed to reduce the methane emitting from their drilling sites.

These emissions don't just harm our planet. When methane is released from oil and gas sites, it is often accompanied by other pollutants that are known to cause additional harm to people's health.

That is why this legislation is so important, and that is why the Trump administration's egregious attempt to eliminate these important rules and let oil and gas companies release more methane from their drilling sites was met with such outrage and fury by citizens across this country.

And you know something?

And not just from the citizens, but from the biggest oil and gas companies in the country, including ExxonMobil, Shell, BP, and more, and also from smaller producers around the country. These are the companies that stand to benefit most from the rollback of the methane rules, and even these are against it.

So when I hear the ranking member talking about how we are going to be on the backs of oil and gas companies, the very companies she is talking about support this legislation today.

I just want to read a few of the names of the companies, large and small, that support the rollback of the Trump administration's methane rule and the reinstatement of the Obama-era rule:

BP America; Shell U.S.; Equinor North America; Total USA; ExxonMobil; Jonah Energy; Pioneer Natural Resources; EQT Corporation; Interstate Natural Gas Association of America; Cheniere; DTE Energy; Equitrans Midstream Corporation; Occidental Petroleum; Devon Energy; Edison Electric Institute, which is a consortium of groups; Center for Liquefied Natural Gas; Austin Energy;

Calpine Corporation; Pacific Gas and Electric Company; Tenaska, Inc.; and others have all submitted comments, and the comments they have submitted are in support of S.J. Res. 14 and the rollback of the Trump administration's egregious rule.

So when my colleagues on the other side say this is going to hurt oil and gas, the very companies they are talking about support this because the Trump administration's rule was so extreme and egregious.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a summary of the quotes in support of this legislation from these companies, a letter from BP, a letter from Occidental, and a letter from Equinor.

#### ENERGY COMPANIES SUPPORT FEDERAL METHANE REGULATIONS

Many oil and gas companies publicly support direct federal regulation of methane because methane pollution hurts public health, the planet, and the industry itself. These companies also support restoring the common-sense requirements to control methane pollution that were eliminated and undermined at the end of 2020.

Methane regulations work to reduce methane emissions and waste from oil and gas operations. To meet the requirements, companies use cost-effective tools and off-the-shelf technologies to find and plug methane leaks and reduce venting and flaring. But the previous administration revoked all federal air pollution limits for oil and gas transmission and storage facilities and created legal confusion that undermines further progress in cutting methane pollution. Here's what industry is saying about closing these loopholes and directly regulating methane:

BP America: "Direct federal regulation of methane is key to preventing leaks throughout industry and protecting the environment—and gets us closer to #netzero. That's why we support the Congressional Review Act methane resolution."

Shell US: "Sound policy surrounding natural gas is critical to its role in the energy transition. We need to restore the direct federal regulation of #methane emissions—and we urge Congress to approve the methane resolution under the Congressional Review Act."

Equinor North America: "Ensuring that natural gas continues to provide climate benefits means reducing emissions from its production. We support the methane resolution under the Congressional Review Act. Direct federal methane regulation is an important step on the pathway to net zero."

Total USA: "Curbing methane emissions with bold policies is imperative to get to #NetZero2050. We welcome direct federal regulation of #methane emissions and support resolution via the Congressional Review Act #cutmethane."

ExxonMobil: "Last year we [ExxonMobil] announced our support for the direct regulation of methane emissions for new and existing oil and gas facilities. That hasn't changed."

Jonah Energy: "Jonah Energy believes in common sense federal regulation of methane emissions to reduce impacts and achieve climate goals. We support Congressional Review Act measure S.J. Res. 14 (<https://lnkd.in/ebHbACW>) that will reverse prior rule-making and allow reasonable federal oversight of methane. In fact, we opposed the rollback by the last administration. Achieving climate goals is important in our backyard, and across the nation. Reasonable federal regulations of methane emissions provide consistency and certainty covering all sectors of natural gas development and promote public confidence our national energy sources.

Pioneer Natural Resources: Pioneer has long supported federal regulation of methane if those regulations encourage innovation and operational flexibility. Clear rules would provide certainty for operators and strong environmental benefits. We support use of the CRA to reinstate regulation of methane."

EQT Corporation: EQT Corporation supports congressional resolutions that would reinstate a rule imposing a federal standard on methane. Company believes the "responsible development of natural gas will help meet future global energy demand as we address climate change together."

Interstate Natural Gas Association of America: "We support federal methane standards . . . our members have a long history of minimizing methane emissions from their operation. A stable regulatory framework will allow the industry to invest in the critical infrastructure necessary to reduce emissions and meet increasing demand for cleaner and more affordable energy."

Cheniere: To maximize the climate benefits of natural gas, we recognize the imperative to minimize #methane emissions across the natural gas value chain. We support effective policies and regulations that reduce methane emissions, including the current Congressional Review Act effort to restore federal regulation of methane emissions. Cheniere will continue to collaborate with industry, academia and the scientific community to deliver cost-effective solutions that reduce methane emissions from the natural gas sector. We also will continue to push for increased transparency regarding methane emissions reporting and data, as well as efforts that create a level playing field with all operators domestically and internationally.

DTE Energy: Strong, sensible methane regulations at the federal and state level give our industry the foundation on which to go even further through these voluntary initiatives. Providing a proper regulatory framework ensures industry's ability to continue to make important progress reducing methane emissions. [Public Comment 11/25/2019]

Equitrans Midstream Corporation: "We must continue to push our industry forward in a meaningful way in order to effectuate real mitigation of climate change impacts, and we support approval of the methane resolution under the Congressional Review Act," said Diana Charletta, president and chief operating officer of Equitrans Midstream.

Occidental Petroleum: "We support the direct regulation of methane . . . because it is very potent and we need to have regulations in place to ensure that we have adequate controls throughout the industry."

Devon Energy: We believe a meaningful reduction in methane emissions is essential to managing the risks of climate change. While the Congressional Review Act is an extraordinary legislative tool that should be used judiciously and with caution, we support the ongoing effort in Congress to chart a path toward a durable framework for regulating methane at the federal level that encourages innovation and operational flexibility.

Edison Electric Institute: EEI supports Congress using the Congressional Review Act to enable EPA to develop strong and cost-effective federal regulations on methane emissions throughout the natural gas supply chain for new and existing sources.

Center for Liquefied Natural Gas: The Center for Liquefied Natural Gas (CLNG) and its members support the proposed resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act (CRA) and the reinstatement of regulations of methane emissions from the natural gas sector.

Austin Energy, Calpine Corporation, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Tenaska Inc, and Others (Joint Comments): "EPA should continue to directly regulate methane from new sources in the oil and natural

gas source category . . . the importance of controlling these emissions is clear when considering that the oil and natural gas source category is the largest source of anthropogenic methane emissions in the US, contributing 31 percent of US methane emissions in 2017, according to EPA's Inventory of US Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2017 (published in 2019)."

BP AMERICA, INC.,

Washington, DC, June 10, 2021.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE AND RANKING MEMBER MCMORRIS RODGERS: bp's ambition is to become a net zero company by 2050 or sooner and to help the world get there too. This includes advocating for policies that support net zero.

bp supports the direct federal regulation of methane for new and existing sources across the value chain. Methane is a potent greenhouse gas with a warming potential 80 times greater than carbon dioxide over the first 20 years in the atmosphere. We believe regulation is needed to ensure all companies are prioritizing methane emissions reductions. This is why bp supports the Congressional Review Act resolution on methane.

We appreciate the leadership of Representative DeGette and others who recognize that regulating methane is good for the environment, business, and for US energy security. Further, we believe regulation can help preserve the role for natural gas in a low carbon future.

bp is in action to reduce methane emissions from our operations. We aim for zero routine flaring in our US onshore operations by 2025 and have recently completed construction of a \$300 million electrified, central processing facility in the Permian Basin in Texas to enable emissions reductions. Additionally, we aim to install methane measurement at all our existing major oil and gas processing sites by 2023, publish the data, and then drive a 50% reduction in the methane intensity of our operations.

This is a critical decade for climate action. We appreciate the leadership of Representative DeGette and the work of this committee to advance this issue in Congress.

I, or a member of my team, will be happy to meet with you or your staff to talk more about bp's ambition and our efforts to minimize methane.

Sincerely,

MARY STREETT,

Senior Vice President, Americas,  
Communications & Advocacy.

— OCCIDENTAL,  
Houston, TX, June 10, 2021.

MEMBERS OF THE ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE: Thank you for the opportunity to provide our views on H.J. Res. 34. The demand for energy and products that rely upon oil and natural gas will continue to rise globally, and we take seriously the charge to provide for those needs while approaching Net-Zero. Occidental was the first U.S. oil and gas company to establish comprehensive net-zero greenhouse gas emissions goals, with a pathway to Net-Zero before 2040 for Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, and an ambition to achieve Net-Zero for Scope 3 emissions before 2050. Your efforts to evaluate and advance legislation to address climate change are critical to helping companies like Occidental achieve these objectives.

Occidental supports the data-driven, direct regulation of methane which is why we support H.J. Res 34. Earlier this year, President Biden directed EPA to draft new methane regulations for both new and existing sources and we are working with the Administration on those efforts. This legislation will clarify EPA's authority to regulate methane and allow EPA additional flexibility to write a thorough rule. Because it has access to the most comprehensive emissions data via GHG reporting program and other means, we strongly believe that EPA should lead the effort to regulate methane. In their rulemaking process, EPA should work with external stakeholders to craft public policy that achieves methane emissions reductions, incentivizes early action, and supports flexibility and innovation. We look forward to sharing data and best practice information about our operations with EPA to assist in the creation of strong and effective regulations.

Occidental thanks Representatives DeGette, Lamb, and Peters for their leadership on this important legislation and we look forward to additional opportunities to collaborate on ways to approach Net-Zero.

Sincerely,

VICKI HOLLUB,  
President and Chief Executive Officer,  
Occidental.

EQUINOR US,  
April 9, 2021.

Hon. TOM CARPER,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Environment  
and Public Works, Washington, DC.

Hon. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO,  
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Environment  
and Public Works, Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,  
Chairman, House Committee on Energy and  
Commerce, Washington, DC.

Hon. CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS,  
Ranking Member, House Committee on Energy  
and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CARPER, RANKING MEMBER CAPITO, CHAIRMAN PALLONE, AND RANKING MEMBER RODGERS: Equinor US encourages members of both the Senate and House to support a proposed resolution of disapproval, under the Congressional Review Act (CRA), to rescind the recent rule "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review" and largely reinstate the Obama-era regulations of methane emissions from the oil and gas sector.

In 2019, we submitted comments to the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) opposing the then proposed rule and outlined our view that regulation of methane is a necessary part of a comprehensive, economy-wide policy program to address global climate change.

In those comments, Equinor US noted that "it is important to have a federal regulatory 'floor' that provides a consistent, flexible, predictable, and comprehensive policy framework for the sector." We stand by this policy approach and believe that a return to the 2012 and 2016 standards, until a more workable regulation or pieces of legislation, considering modern technological developments, can be passed and/or implemented.

Equinor US appreciates the strong leadership of many in Congress who recognize the role of responsibly-produced natural gas in the energy transition and we believe that the deployment of the Congressional Review Act to undo the 2020 rule is appropriate and in line with our own net-zero ambitions.

Sincerely,

CHRIS L. GOLDEN,  
Senior Vice President, Global  
Unconventionals, Equinor US.

□ 0930

I will just say that if we don't act now and if we let this rule stand, it is going to increase methane emissions in this country by nearly 1.6 tons by 2025. It will also result in a release of an additional 1.8 million tons of volatile organic compounds and more than 16,000 tons of hazardous air pollutants right into the air that we breathe.

If we are going to get serious about addressing the climate crisis, let's get serious about cutting our methane emissions. If we are going to get serious about protecting the public's health, let's pass this legislation today.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bill that has widespread support, not just from environmentalists, not just from the public, but from the oil industry itself.

Let's do what the people have elected us to do. Let's put their health and safety, and the health and safety of our planet, above all else. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on S.J. Res. 14.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 14, which would increase the cost of energy for consumers and result in the loss of good-paying American jobs in our energy and manufacturing sectors.

My district in northwest and west-central Ohio is home to over 60,000 manufacturing jobs, with thousands more to come with recent announcements made in the past few weeks. One of the key factors that businesses consider when they make decisions about expanding or relocating is their ability to keep energy costs down while still being able to maintain profitable operations.

Because of the American energy renaissance, fueled by lower domestic oil and natural gas production costs and the Trump administration's common-sense regulatory approach, we have seen more companies come to or return to the United States and bring with them high-paying, quality jobs to our communities.

My fear is that by returning to the Obama EPA standards, we will be reasserting an outdated and burdensome regulatory regime that will sacrifice all the gains we have made in building up America's manufacturing sector.

If the argument is about addressing climate change, then we really need to acknowledge the fact that the United States has been a global leader in emissions reduction since 2005. Since that time, emissions have fallen by more than 20 percent on a per capita basis.

We should be focusing on innovative solutions and not accelerating the promulgation of cumbersome or duplicative regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose S.J. Res. 14, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a strong environmentalist.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I am here to speak in favor of S.J. Res. 14, a resolution I co-led with Representatives DEGETTE and LAMB.

We need to address methane emissions for several reasons, and today, I want to mention three.

First, controlling methane is the single most important immediate step we can take to combat climate change, and that is because methane is a super-pollutant responsible for about 25 percent of the man-made warming we experience today. This is the low-hanging fruit in climate mitigation.

My Republican colleagues never miss a chance—and you will hear this today—to point out that the natural gas revolution has contributed to our historic energy independence and cut our carbon dioxide emissions from energy production. That is right, but there is still a problem, and that problem is fugitive methane emissions.

While burning natural gas can lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by as much as 40 to 50 percent versus burning coal, almost all of that benefit, from a climate change perspective, is wiped out even with small leaks of methane, which we have today. Put simply, to reap the climate benefits of natural gas, which are often touted, we have to address methane emissions.

Second, controlling methane is critical to the economic competitiveness of the U.S. natural gas industry. We should say thanks to the oil and gas industry when they do the right thing, but let's not fool ourselves by thinking that they are doing this because they are altruists. They are doing this because this is important to competitiveness. They are doing this because this makes American oil and gas more competitive. The reason is that world markets and domestic politics will not tolerate natural gas as a so-called bridge fuel unless the industry can prove, with real credibility and transparency, that it has fixed its methane problem.

It is increasingly apparent that the viability of exporting U.S. liquefied natural gas, or LNG, depends on American policies to address methane pollution.

Three of the largest LNG importers in the world, South Korea, Japan, and the European Union, have set goals to reduce emissions to net-zero by mid-century. These nations will demand verifiably clean gas from the United States.

On top of this, investors are increasingly putting pressure on financial institutions and demanding climate-smart investment portfolios. Natural gas will solely be seen as a climate risk and not as a climate opportunity if methane leaks persist.

We saw this recently in the cancellation by France of a deal for liquefied natural gas from Brownsville, \$7 billion over 20 years. Ultimately, they were able to put that back together, but this is a sign of what is to come. If we don't get it right here, it is going to hurt business.

They all sounded like businesses to me, what Ms. DEGETTE talked about. I am not from Texas or Oklahoma, but I have heard of Exxon, and I have heard of the American Petroleum Institute. If they are for it, it says something about where business is, what they think about competitiveness.

Third, U.S. companies can lead the world in developing technologies to monitor and reduce methane emissions. Dealing with climate change is a science project. It is not a jobs program, but it does create a lot of jobs.

Seventy-five percent of the manufacturing firms and 88 percent of service firms in the sector report that they would create more jobs if the national methane standards were reinstated.

And the starting salary for methane mitigation jobs is nearly 10 percent higher than the national average salary and can pay up to \$140,000 a year.

These companies represent the best of American innovation, creating economic opportunity and tackling global challenges at the same time.

Today, we in Congress can soundly reject one of the most irresponsible environmental rollbacks of the prior administration. We can restore robust methane pollution standards, and we can clear a path for stronger protections in the future.

I am proud to be a co-lead on this resolution. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes." This is a win-win for climate, public health, and U.S. industry.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), my colleague.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this harmful methane resolution. It is just another example of this majority's and this administration's ever-changing "support our global competitors at the expense of America's workers" energy narrative.

They say they don't want to ban hydraulic fracturing, interfere with American energy dominance, or increase supply chain dependence on China, but with their renewed Obama-era regulations, the cancellation of America's pipeline projects, and proposed bans on domestic plastics manufacturing, it is clear they have an ulterior energy plan that might as well have been written in Moscow or Beijing. And the American taxpayer is footing the bill.

As oil and gas prices rise with our country reopening from the pandemic, there should be an increase in new wells being drilled and rigs being brought online to meet demand, but reports suggest this is not the case.

Under pressure from radical environmentalists, coupled with the risks of an uncertain regulatory environment, American oil and gas producers are reducing drilling investments, costing jobs, and increasing the likelihood of continued price spikes at the pump and at the grocery store.

While Democrats continue their assault on America's hard-earned global

energy dominance, our adversaries have positioned themselves to take advantage of America's absence at the leadership table while also making a profit.

In just the latest example, President Biden lifted sanctions on the completion of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, Putin's pipeline, which will be operational soon, sending Russian gas to Europe and billions into Putin's pocket.

While he lifts sanctions on the Russians here at home, the President is, in effect, imposing sanctions on America's energy workers, all without Russia or China having to lift a finger.

America's energy security—in effect, our national security—cannot depend on President Biden's weak leadership any longer.

Mr. Speaker, you can just add this methane resolution to the long list of President Biden's predictably terrible policy solutions. Not only are we better than this, but we are smarter than this.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, this CRA is another act by the Biden administration to undercut American energy production. It is plain and simple.

In committee, I offered an amendment to this resolution that would simply express Congress' disapproval for the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, which would bring Russian gas to Europe.

Now, for the entire Trump administration, Democrats were obsessed with imagined Russian influence over his policies, repeatedly calling him a Russian agent. If Trump had waived sanctions on a Russian company and a friend of Vladimir Putin, like President Biden just did, there would be an immediate call for an investigation. You guys would probably try to impeach him again.

President Biden just killed the Keystone pipeline and continues to hamstring domestic producers, particularly smaller producers, killing American jobs and American energy production. It is truly baffling and illogical to me that he is willing to greenlight Russian energy projects while he kills American projects and kills American jobs.

You know, the irony is that these energy-destroying policies actually have a negative impact on the environment. Think about this: Russian natural gas exported to Europe has a lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions profile that is 41 percent higher than American LNG exported to Europe. If Europe were to switch from dirtier Russian gas to clean-burning U.S. natural gas through LNG exports, global emissions would actually go down by 70 million tons each year.

The United States is the number one oil and gas producer in the world, but

we also lead the world in emissions reduction, something you all don't want to acknowledge.

Putin would love nothing more than for America to be energy dependent, and President Biden is helping him achieve this goal. And Vladimir Putin is laughing.

I urge my colleagues to defend American energy production and vote against this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LAMB), one of the chief sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill.

I would like to point out to my colleagues and anyone watching at home that I actually think that, today, the difference is not really between business and labor; it is not between regulation and nonregulation; it is really not even between Democrats and Republicans. I think what separates supporters of today's bill from its detractors are those who are thinking in the long term versus those who are thinking in the short term.

In the long term, climate change truly is a threat to American national security. The Marine Corps, in which I served, has already had to consider whether it should move some of its historic bases, including Parris Island, perhaps the soul of the Marine Corps, simply due to sea level rise.

The number of \$1 billion catastrophic events in our country last year was 22. The average is seven over the last 40-year period.

This is getting more expensive and more dangerous every year. In the long term, businesses that have to compete for capital and compete for market share in markets all around the world understand this, that this is our world now, that decarbonization is an absolute requirement to compete successfully both as the United States and as an individual business in the world that we are going into.

The businesses that are thinking long term have already taken steps to do this, and the businesses that are thinking short term are pointing to the costs, the drawbacks, and the requirements, all of which are real.

None of us stand here today to causally make anything more difficult on an American company that is trying to preserve jobs and succeed in this economy, but there are some things we just have to do.

To use the words of an executive at Southwestern Energy Company:

What some in the industry do not get is that we are transitioning to a low-carbon economy. We need to show the climate benefit of our product.

Or, you could take the word of the chairwoman and president of BP America: "We have to reduce methane emissions for natural gas to realize its full potential."

□ 0945

And in my own hometown of Pittsburgh, we are happy to have headquartered the largest producer of natural gas in the United States, EQT. And even though under the Trump administration the EPA came to Pittsburgh to announce this absurd rollback of a rule that's good for business and good for the environment, EQT's president and CEO just 2 days ago said that tackling methane represents an opportunity for the United States because our natural gas, American natural gas, can become the decarbonizing commodity of choice.

So I have heard some of my friends on the other side point out, that, yes, the United States has done quite a lot already to reduce emissions and is doing more, and not all our competitors, like Russia and China, are doing the same.

That is okay. Our market opportunity will come from attracting businesses among our allies, South Korea, Japan, the European Union. And if you just picture now a politics of the near future where the European Union is placing carbon tariffs on every product that comes in and out, lower carbon, American L&G will simply out-compete Russian products, or Iranian products, or any other product. That is the world that we live in now and that is what it will mean for us to compete.

Today's bill is about one thing and one thing only: the national interest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

America's oil and gas industry is truly the backbone of the American economy, supporting 10 million jobs and contributing to billions of dollars of economic development in all 50 States.

The energy industry is critical to our economic and national security, providing low and stable energy prices to American families and ensuring our independence from the Middle East and Russia.

Despite these essential contributions, Democrats here are attempting to strap the industry with duplicative and unnecessary regulations. This resolution will contribute to American job losses and higher energy costs for American consumers, right on their energy bills.

This will also not reduce worldwide emissions, and the reason is because China is building coal-fired power plants at a rate that outpaces the rest of the world combined.

So what we are doing here with not only this resolution, but the other policies that my friends on the other side of the aisle are pushing, is we are actually hurting America, losing American

jobs, giving up our energy independence so we are reliant on China and Russia and the Middle East.

Why in the world would we do that? Mr. LAMB said this is for America. I totally disagree. This will hurt America and this bill will help China and Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 18½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to implore this governing body to consider the consequences of using the Congressional Review Act as a vehicle to reinstate the harmful Obama-era regulations on methane emissions.

American energy independence is key to the economic and national security of Hoosiers and, of course, of all Americans.

These unnecessary and redundant regulations on new methane emissions will stifle responsible energy development and undercut our domestic energy potential. Because of the additional Federal regulations this would create, Hoosiers will pay more to heat their homes and to cook their meals, which we are already seeing right now.

As a veteran of the petroleum industry, I know that free market innovation has always been the key driver to developing more cost-effective and environmentally friendly uses of natural gas. Let's keep doing that.

The burdensome regulations like the one before us today have never been the answer to improve our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Washington to protect Hoosiers' way of life back home in the Sixth District, and that is why I will continue to advocate for an all-of-the-above, not everything-but approach to energy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this attempt to cripple American energy.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes now to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who also represents one of my favorite places, Santa Fe.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I do welcome everybody in this Chamber to New Mexico, which is indeed one of the beautiful places that I get to call home. But you know what, New Mexico, my beautiful place I call home is also ground zero for the climate crisis.

The West is experiencing a devastating drought, coupled with damaging wildfires, and these are caused, undoubtedly, by the climate crisis we are experiencing. My beautiful State is also home to both the Permian and the

San Juan Basins. And because of that, we also have some of the highest levels of methane pollution. We also have some of the highest levels of asthma rates among our beautiful children.

And every bit of methane that is released is wasted. It is wasted. It is a valuable resource that is released into the air by methane venting, through flaring, and simply because they have not maintained their sites.

But methane that is released and flared and leaked is also a resource upon which my State cannot collect severance taxes, upon which my State cannot collect royalties. And so when that methane is leaked and flared and vented, those same children who are suffering from those high asthma rates, they lose the resources that should go into our public education.

Mr. Speaker, I will say that my State—which needs every little nickel and dime, because we are a poor State, and which relies on those oil and gas revenues—what did we do? We recently enacted some of our own rules to curb methane emissions from oil and gas activity, and these rules are now considered to be the best in the country.

If New Mexico can lead the way, we can follow it here in Congress, because taking action at the Federal level is reasonable, it is common sense.

As Don Schreiber, one of my constituents and a rancher in New Mexico who has those issues on his site says, “New Mexicans built our oil and gas infrastructure, and these same communities can now design, manufacture, and install the technology to monitor and prevent methane emissions.”

Because you know what? Regulation spurs innovation, and we are looking forward to that innovation and those good jobs that will come from the methane regulation that we will have now when we overturn this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Senator HEINRICH, for introducing and advancing this legislation in the Senate, and my great colleagues here, Representatives DEGETTE, LAMB, and PALLONE for advancing and championing the cause of my wonderful children and students and State here on this rule.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this partisan resolution is unnecessary for a number of reasons. At its core, this is a solution that is looking for a problem.

The oil industry already is voluntarily reducing methane emissions and the United States has led the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the last two decades. Innovation is the ultimate answer to cutting emissions. We cannot afford to stifle advancement.

As a Nation, we cannot regulate our way to a cleaner environment. Most importantly, new methane regulations are duplicative of existing Federal and



State regulations under the Clean Air Act for volatile organic compounds known as VOCs.

The EPA determined in an earlier rulemaking that “rescinding the methane limits will not actually change the amount of methane emissions reductions.”

This resolution is not about methane emissions or climate change. The truth is that we already regulate methane. The EPA and the States have strong standards in place for volatile organic compounds and methane.

The existing standards and the pollution control equipment installed at oil and gas facilities help to manage both methane and VOCs because they are both produced from the same source and have a similar chemistry and behavior.

The real intent of this misguided resolution is simple—the oil and gas sector is just the tip of the iceberg—the purpose is to give the EPA authority to use Section 111 of the Clean Air Act to regulate every other sector of our economy.

Congress must continue to embrace the bottom-up innovation that will result in leaps in efficiency far greater than any mandate, instead of expensive overregulation that will take money out of working Americans’ pockets.

As a Nation, we can do better. As a Congress, we must do better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “no” on this resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, you can put American behind Equinor. It doesn’t make it an American company. It is a Norwegian company that used to be called Statoil; now it is called Equinor that has American operations.

You can put American behind Shell. It doesn’t make it an American company. It is a Dutch company who has its own legal problems in its own court that has American operations. I appreciate both of them.

At times they have done business in North Dakota; they have been great corporate citizens. You can talk about Exxon and you can talk about BP; you can talk about Shell. But let’s be careful when we talk about all companies big and small that support this industry, because the one caveat with all of these companies—and this is true—the vast majority of their production does not occur onshore and most often does not even occur in the United States.

And so what does that mean? They are not subject to this CRA.

Small and medium-sized gas companies do not support this regulation. North Dakota oil and gas companies do not support this regulation. And it is not because they are interested in polluting. It is because they don’t want to be duplicatively regulated from the wellhead to the market.

States are already doing this. We have heard this from New Mexico. North Dakota is regulating this. We have our industrial cushion; we have our DEQ.

But the real problem with this EPA regulation and these Obama-era policies coming back is not only its duplicative regulation, but it actually stifles innovation; because the one thing State regulators can do significantly better than the Federal Government is respond quickly—adapt. So when an industry comes to you and says, Hey, I have a way to do this better, they will work with you, they will get it done. We see it happen every day in the Oil Patch in western North Dakota.

The problem is Federal regulation at its very core is unwieldy, it is burdensome, and it gives a tremendous market share advantage to large companies over smaller companies.

We need to stop duplicative regulation. We need to allow industries to regulate and States to innovate and regulate. And we know this because we have heard it a lot. If the market is demanding, companies are going to do it. Why do we need the burdensome Federal regulation?

□ 1000

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to a couple things I heard.

One is this tip of the iceberg idea that we are doing something beyond methane by doing this. Of course, that is not how it works around here. The laws are specifically written around what we are doing. We are only voting on this. I can tell you that if we were doing more than this, we might get a different response from the oil and gas industry than we have seen. That is not a real argument.

The other thing is that this is somehow cooked up by the Biden administration as a way to undercut oil and gas. Again, I want to go through all of the names that Ms. DEGETTE went through of the companies and organizations that support this regulation, but it is hard to argue that the American Petroleum Institute is anything other than American.

It is also hard to argue, even with a company that is based someplace else, that they would be arguing to burden, as it is characterized, their United States operations with these regulations. There would be no incentive for them to do that, no matter where the corporate headquarters is based.

The fact is that these companies see this as a way to be competitive, and it is not unprecedented. One thing we did on the committee last term that became part of the year-end spending plan was the American Innovation and Manufacturers Act, which regulated HFCs. If you recall, the industry supported the institution of standards

around HFCs so that it could compete successfully with manufacturers around the world that are building from the same standards.

It was actually helpful for them to have a uniform standard that they could innovate around, and that is why Republicans and Democrats supported that and it became part of a bipartisan end-of-year package. We are in the same situation here where businesses are saying, set a standard here.

Don’t tell us that we are going to get one set of regulations, by the way, in Colorado, and virtually no regulations in Texas. We are not being duplicative at all. What we are doing is setting a standard. Let’s set a Federal standard. Let’s do it at the request of the industry and with the cooperation of the industry to make sure we get it right.

And I guess the other remarkable thing that is implied by all of this discussion is that we are talking about regulating methane out of oil and gas production. No one is talking about banning oil and gas. We wouldn’t have to be talking about methane at all if we were talking about that. In fact, we are trying to take oil and gas and get it right, to get it competitive, and get it to be climate-friendly for our future generations.

So I thought that the one glaring omission from my colleagues’ arguments is: How do you explain so much support from American oil and gas companies for this regulation?

I wouldn’t suggest that it is unanimous. I would say probably it is not. But to dismiss it is really, I think, missing the point. And I think it is obvious that this industry sees this as an advantage in terms of competitiveness going forward, as Mr. LAMB said as well.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this Congressional Review Act resolution, which would nullify a rule put in place by President Trump that contributed to our American energy domestic dominance.

Unfortunately, for Democrats, this misguided solution in search of a non-existent problem trades American livelihoods for radical activist priorities.

The United States leads the world in emissions reductions, thanks to the natural gas revolution. Our emissions declined significantly over the last few decades, while natural gas production spiked by more than 50 percent, proving that renewable resources like natural gas provide a clean, low-cost energy alternative.

This CRA will only limit our domestic supply and force us to look abroad, once again, empowering OPEC and Russia to determine the price of living our daily lives. As the ranking member of the Energy and Minerals Resources Subcommittee, I know that our domestic energy producers are the best in the world.

With many being small business owners, they are a testament to American innovation as they deliver us low-cost energy while reducing emissions. We need to return to American energy first policies that empower our workers and American innovation, and not failed policies that hand the keys over to our rivals.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I urge a “no” vote on this resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HERRELL).

Ms. HERRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise also in strong opposition to this resolution, as it is yet another attempt by my Democratic colleagues to nickel and dime the most essential industry in my district out of business.

The energy policies of the Biden administration have been a complete and utter disaster. American jobs are being lost and gas prices are soaring due to a retreat from the policies of the Trump administration that created American energy dominance.

Small and midsize oil and gas producers employ tens of thousands of New Mexicans and contribute millions of dollars in revenues to my State's budget. These essential businesses are the ones that will be most negatively impacted by the passage of this resolution.

Small and midsize producers are already under attack by the ban on new oil and gas leases on Federal lands put in place by this administration, which a Federal judge ruled to be illegal just last week.

Instead of approving foreign pipelines and implementing duplicative and costly regulations, which strengthen the hands of our enemies, this administration and this House should be focused on creating jobs here at home and lowering energy costs for all Americans.

I, and many other of my Republican colleagues, have put forward common-sense pieces of legislation to ensure economic and environmental sustainability for our constituents. This legislation does just the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation and to join us on this side of the aisle in fighting to continue the American energy dominance agenda of the previous administration that resulted in a cleaner environment and a vibrant economy.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to bring to this body's attention that this resolution will actually put New Mexico on the same playing field as the rest of the country because, as I noted earlier, New Mexico has now adopted some of the strictest methane regulations in the country.

And those regulations, similar to what we are seeing now, were adopted in consultation and with the support of many in the oil and gas industry who participated in the rulemaking, who recognize that it is in their best interest to operate in a manner that is safe, in a manner that does not lose this precious resource. That is how we came to our regulations in New Mexico.

But we are at a disadvantage in New Mexico because, as it was noted earlier, if some States have nice, good regulations with regard to methane emissions and others don't, then in the Permian Basin, for example, what would stop a company from saying: I am going to drill in Texas and not in New Mexico because they are protecting our environment in New Mexico?

So what I look forward to seeing is having New Mexico be at the same place as the rest of the country, so that we are not losing our drilling to Texas, who doesn't have it. Mr. Speaker, I like the idea of everybody has the same set of rules.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is in a long line of attacks from a hostile administration, and some of my Democratic colleagues, against oil and gas, conventional fuels, which has blessed our country with a safe, affordable abundant supply of energy. It fuels our economy. It keeps energy costs low for consumers and working families. It gives us energy independence.

In addition to the Paris climate and millions of jobs going away in the future as we implement that, pipeline and critical infrastructure cancellations, public land drilling moratoriums, weaponizing the tax code—because that is what is next—as they do away with ordinary and necessary depreciation and general business expenses, the posture from my colleagues is hostility toward an industry that has been so good to this country and to working families.

In this case, we would go back to the Obama-era regulatory regime that is costly and burdensome, not to the multinational oil and gas companies. They welcome it because they will just increase their market share. It is the mom and pop, small business, independent producers who make up 85 percent of the production of oil and gas. They can't take this. They will shut their doors. We will shutter family-owned small businesses.

And for what?

Trace amounts of methane gas. The cost benefit does not make any sense. This is a sledgehammer-to-a-fly approach. The real emitters on methane gas, if that is your goal, downstream, large-scale industrial utilities, and other industrial operations, that is where we ought to focus. That is what the Trump administration focused on, gave room for innovation, respected

State regulation, and that partnership and Federalism.

Mr. Speaker, that is my position. I implore my colleagues to join me in opposing this and get back to some reasonable approaches to stewarding our environment and economic growth.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise vehemently opposed to the Democrats' latest move in their war on American energy independence.

Today's misguided resolution calling for additional onerous regulations from the Obama administration era to be reimposed on the fossil fuel industry will only lead to a lack of energy security.

Just 2 years ago, the United States became the number one producer of oil and natural gas in the world, thanks to President Trump's administration's deregulation that allowed private energy innovators and entrepreneurs to flourish.

I represent the Permian Basin, and let me just state for the record that Texas does have methane regulations, a completely false accusation that I have heard three times in this debate. Energy security is national security. And now we risk losing our competitive edge on the world stage with needless regulations that will hurt small and independent producers and crush innovation; the same private innovation that has allowed the United States to lead the way in reducing methane emissions to a 20-year low.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation relies on affordable, reliable energy; the same affordable, reliable energy that has raised a billion people out of poverty in the last 10 years—a billion people out of poverty.

Today, global demand is going to continue to increase. We cannot allow foreign adversaries, like China and Russia and others, to profit off of our overly regulated State. Let me say again, energy security is national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this resolution and standing up for American energy independence.

□ 1015

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close if the gentleman is.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is just the tip of the iceberg. EPA will use the resolution to clear the way for other sources without formally establishing that a



pollutant significantly contributes to harmful air pollution as a predicate for new regulations. Manufacturing, paper, plastics, metals, and virtually every other industry in America certainly could be next.

We must not allow overregulation to crush the energy jobs that America wants and America needs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is quickly becoming clear that the greatest potential to curb methane, and thus climate change, in the next decade is in the fossil fuel sector.

The U.N. Environment Program and the Climate and Clean Air Coalition published the “Global Methane Assessment” just last month, and they found that fast and ambitious methane mitigation is one of the best strategies available today to deliver immediate and long-lasting benefits for climate, agriculture, human, and ecosystem health.

They also found that rapid and dramatic methane pollution cuts could both slow global warming and prevent a quarter-million deaths every year.

Also, reduction measures used to curb methane from the oil and gas sector would also cost the least or, in some cases, even have negative costs, as captured methane can be resold for revenue in the oil and gas sector.

These relatively inexpensive methane reduction methods are possible with currently available technology, like fixing leaks in gas pipelines and stopping venting in gas drilling.

These findings support what many already know to be true, that ambitiously addressing methane pollution can yield tremendous climate, public health, and financial—and I stress “and financial”—benefits across the economy. This is why we see most of the oil and gas companies supporting this resolution.

Disapproving a rule that would lead to an increase in methane pollution, and reinstating the 2016 rule’s commonsense and cost-effective safeguards, should be an easy “yes” vote. For that reason, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to oppose S.J. Res. 14, the Methane rule Congressional Review Act repeal. The Democrat majority and the Administration are not passing this legislation for climate change, they are passing it to support big oil and foreign petrol dictators.

We are in a weird place in this Nation when the action of hurting American energy development in favor of foreign development is celebrated by the majority, but that is where we are today. While my Majority colleagues are celebrating this as a massive win, the reality is the only people winning from this action are people who don’t need wins, and the losers are the American people.

By repealing this common sense balanced rule, this Congress will now put the agencies

in a place with fewer tools, fewer options, and on a path for a rule which will directly harm most of our nation’s oil and gas producers, while leaving the world’s worst actors free to continue polluting the globe. America’s oil industry isn’t made up of supermajor oil players, much of America’s oil comes from small and mid-sized producers. The rules proposed by the Obama Administration would have decimated that sector of the oil and gas industry with burdensome costs and massive paperwork requirements, all for a fractional impact on methane emissions. The rule drafted by the Trump Administration recognized this and would have protected all industry while at the same time working to lower our national methane emissions. However, as a result of this action today the Democrat Majority is deciding that they want to side against small businesses and join the side of Big Oil pushing costly, burdensome, and ineffective methane regulations on all American producers. The result will be an oil and gas industry dominated by bigger and bigger oil companies using their size and buying ability to squeeze out small producers.

But Big Oil isn’t the only winner Democrats are picking today. Foreign petrol dictators are winners as well. Not a single foreign producer is obligated to meet our methane rules for their production. So while the result of this bill will be to squeeze small oil and gas producers in Bakersfield and Kern, California, the foreign, Russian and Saudi imports that make up a majority of the California oil consumption will be untouched. There isn’t a single Aramco, Saudi, oil well in the world that will comply with the methane rule that will be produced as a result of this action today. But there will be millions and billions of barrels of Saudi oil consumed in California over the next decades.

Again, don’t let the majority fool you today, this action isn’t about reducing methane emissions or impacting climate change, this action is about Big Government supporting Big Oil and giving foreign petrol dictatorships an advantage over American producers. That is why I am voting no on this bill and urge all my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 191, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—229

|         |             |          |
|---------|-------------|----------|
| Adams   | Allred      | Axne     |
| Aguilar | Auchincloss | Barragán |

|                   |                 |                |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Bass              | Green, Al (TX)  | Omar           |
| Beatty            | Grijalva        | Pallone        |
| Bera              | Harder (CA)     | Panetta        |
| Beyer             | Hayes           | Pappas         |
| Bishop (GA)       | Higgins (NY)    | Pascarell      |
| Blumenauer        | Himes           | Payne          |
| Blunt Rochester   | Horsford        | Perlmutter     |
| Bonamici          | Houlahan        | Peters         |
| Bourdeaux         | Hoyer           | Phillips       |
| Bowman            | Huffman         | Pingree        |
| Boyle, Brendan F. | Jackson Lee     | Pocan          |
| Brown             | Jacobs (CA)     | Porter         |
| Brownley          | Jayapal         | Pressley       |
| Bush              | Jeffries        | Price (NC)     |
| Bustos            | Johnson (GA)    | Quigley        |
| Butterfield       | Johnson (TX)    | Raskin         |
| Carbajal          | Jones           | Reed           |
| Cárdenas          | Kabele          | Rice (NY)      |
| Carson            | Kaptur          | Ross           |
| Carter (LA)       | Katko           | Roybal-Allard  |
| Cartwright        | Keating         | Ruiz           |
| Case              | Kelly (IL)      | Ruppersberger  |
| Casten            | Khanna          | Rush           |
| Castor (FL)       | Kildee          | Ryan           |
| Castro (TX)       | Kilmer          | Salazar        |
| Chu               | Kim (CA)        | Sánchez        |
| Cicilline         | Kim (NJ)        | Sarbanes       |
| Clark (MA)        | Kind            | Scanlon        |
| Clarke (NY)       | Kirkpatrick     | Schakowsky     |
| Cleaver           | Krishnamoorthi  | Schiff         |
| Clyburn           | Kuster          | Schneider      |
| Cohen             | Lamb            | Schrader       |
| Connolly          | Langevin        | Schrier        |
| Cooper            | Larsen (WA)     | Scott (VA)     |
| Correa            | Larson (CT)     | Scott, David   |
| Costa             | Lawrence        | Sewell         |
| Courtney          | Lawson (FL)     | Sherman        |
| Craig             | Lee (CA)        | Sherrill       |
| Crist             | Lee (NV)        | Sires          |
| Crow              | Leger Fernandez | Slotkin        |
| Cuellar           | Levin (CA)      | Smith (WA)     |
| Davids (KS)       | Levin (MI)      | Soto           |
| Davis, Danny K.   | Lieu            | Spanberger     |
| Dean              | Lofgren         | Speier         |
| DeFazio           | Lowenthal       | Stansbury      |
| DeGette           | Luria           | Stanton        |
| DeLauro           | Lynch           | Stevens        |
| DelBene           | Mace            | Strickland     |
| Delgado           | Malinowski      | Suozi          |
| Demings           | Maloney         | Swailwell      |
| DeSaulnier        | Carolyn B.      | Takano         |
| Deutch            | Maloney, Sean   | Thompson (CA)  |
| Dingell           | Manning         | Thompson (MS)  |
| Doggett           | Mast            | Titus          |
| Doyle, Michael F. | Matsui          | Tlaib          |
| Escobar           | McBath          | Tonko          |
| Eshoo             | McCollum        | Torres (CA)    |
| Espallat          | McEachin        | Torres (NY)    |
| Evans             | McGovern        | Trahan         |
| Fitzpatrick       | McNerney        | Underwood      |
| Fletcher          | Meeks           | Upton          |
| Foster            | Meijer          | Van Drew       |
| Frankel, Lois     | Meng            | Vargas         |
| Gaetz             | Mfume           | Veasey         |
| Galleo            | Moore (WI)      | Vela           |
| Garamendi         | Morelle         | Velázquez      |
| Garbarino         | Moulton         | Wasserman      |
| Garcia (IL)       | Mrvan           | Schultz        |
| Garcia (TX)       | Murphy (FL)     | Waters         |
| Golden            | Nadler          | Watson Coleman |
| Gomez             | Napolitano      | Welch          |
| Gonzalez,         | Neal            | Wexton         |
| Vicente           | Neguse          | Wild           |
| Gottheimer        | Newman          | Williams (GA)  |
|                   | O’Halloran      | Wilson (FL)    |
|                   | Ocasio-Cortez   | Yarmuth        |

NAYS—191

|             |             |               |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| Aderholt    | Buck        | Davis, Rodney |
| Allen       | Bucshon     | DesJarlais    |
| Amodei      | Budd        | Diaz-Balart   |
| Armstrong   | Burchett    | Donalds       |
| Arrington   | Burgess     | Duncan        |
| Babin       | Calvert     | Dunn          |
| Bacon       | Cammack     | Emmer         |
| Baird       | Carl        | Estes         |
| Balderson   | Carter (TX) | Fallon        |
| Banks       | Cawthorn    | Feenstra      |
| Bentz       | Chabot      | Ferguson      |
| Bergman     | Cheney      | Fischbach     |
| Bice (OK)   | Cline       | Fitzgerald    |
| Biggs       | Cloud       | Fleischmann   |
| Bilirakis   | Clyde       | Fortenberry   |
| Bishop (NC) | Cole        | Foxx          |
| Boebert     | Comer       | Franklin, C.  |
| Bost        | Crawford    | Scott         |
| Brady       | Crenshaw    | Gallagher     |
| Brooks      | Curtis      | Garcia (CA)   |
| Buchanan    | Davidson    | Gibbs         |

|                 |               |               |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Gimenez         | LaTurner      | Rose          |
| Gohmert         | Lesko         | Rosendale     |
| Gonzales, Tony  | Letlow        | Rouzer        |
| Gonzalez (OH)   | Long          | Roy           |
| Good (VA)       | Loudermilk    | Rutherford    |
| Gooden (TX)     | Lucas         | Scalise       |
| Granger         | Luetkemeyer   | Schweikert    |
| Graves (MO)     | Malliotakis   | Scott, Austin |
| Green (TN)      | Mann          | Sessions      |
| Greene (GA)     | Massie        | Simpson       |
| Griffith        | McCarthy      | Smith (MO)    |
| Grothman        | McCaul        | Smith (NE)    |
| Guest           | McClain       | Smith (NJ)    |
| Guthrie         | McClintock    | Smucker       |
| Hagedorn        | McHenry       | Spartz        |
| Harris          | McKinley      | Stauber       |
| Harshbarger     | Meuser        | Steel         |
| Hartzler        | Miller (IL)   | Stefanik      |
| Herrrell        | Miller (WV)   | Steil         |
| Herrera Beutler | Miller-Meeks  | Steube        |
| Hice (GA)       | Moolenaar     | Stewart       |
| Higgins (LA)    | Mooney        | Taylor        |
| Hill            | Moore (AL)    | Tenney        |
| Hinson          | Moore (UT)    | Thompson (PA) |
| Hollingsworth   | Mullin        | Tiffany       |
| Hudson          | Murphy (NC)   | Timmons       |
| Huizenga        | Nehls         | Turner        |
| Jackson         | Newhouse      | Valadao       |
| Jacobs (NY)     | Norman        | Van Dyne      |
| Johnson (OH)    | Nunes         | Wagner        |
| Johnson (SD)    | Obernolte     | Walberg       |
| Jordan          | Owens         | Walorski      |
| Joyce (OH)      | Palazzo       | Waltz         |
| Joyce (PA)      | Palmer        | Weber (TX)    |
| Keller          | Pence         | Webster (FL)  |
| Kelly (MS)      | Perry         | Wenstrup      |
| Kelly (PA)      | Pfleger       | Westerman     |
| Kinzinger       | Posey         | Williams (TX) |
| Kustoff         | Reschenthaler | Wilson (SC)   |
| LaHood          | Rice (SC)     | Wittman       |
| LaMalfa         | Rodgers (WA)  | Womack        |
| Lamborn         | Rogers (AL)   | Young         |
| Latta           | Rogers (KY)   | Zeldin        |

## NOT VOTING—10

|             |              |          |
|-------------|--------------|----------|
| Barr        | Graves (LA)  | Norcross |
| Carter (GA) | Hern         | Trone    |
| Fulcher     | Issa         |          |
| Gosar       | Johnson (LA) |          |

## □ 1048

Mr. SESSIONS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “YEA” on Rollcall No. 185.

Stated against:

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 185.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO  
HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

|                  |                   |                  |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Aderholt         | Gotthelmer        | Miller (WV)      |
| (Moolenaar)      | (Panetta)         | (Walorski)       |
| Amodei           | Graves (MO)       | Mullin (Cole)    |
| (Balderson)      | (Wagner)          | Napolitano       |
| Barragán (Clark) | Grijalva (García) | (Correa)         |
| (MA))            | (IL))             | Pappas (Clark)   |
| Beatty           | Himes (Clark)     | (MA))            |
| (Lawrence)       | (MA))             | Payne (Pallone)  |
| Buchanan         | Hoyer (Brown)     | Reed (Gonzalez)  |
| (Walorski)       | Johnson (TX)      | (OH)             |
| Burgess          | (Jeffries)        | Rice (NY)        |
| (Jackson)        | Kirkpatrick       | (Peters)         |
| Castor (FL)      | (Stanton)         | Ruiz (Aguilar)   |
| (Demings)        | Kuster (Clark)    | Rush             |
| Crist (Deutch)   | (MA))             | (Underwood)      |
| DeFazio (Davids) | Lawson (FL)       | Sewell (DelBene) |
| (KS)             | (Evans)           | Sires (Pallone)  |
| DeSaulnier       | Lieu (Beyer)      | Stefanik (Katko) |
| (Matsui)         | Lowenthal         | Strickland       |
| Escobar (Speier) | (Beyer)           | (DelBene)        |
| Frankel, Lois    | McHenry (Budd)    | Suozi (Panetta)  |
| (Clark (MA))     | Meng (Clark)      | Swalwell         |
| Gimenez          | (MA))             | (Gomez)          |
| (Malliotakis)    |                   | Titus (Connolly) |

|                |                 |               |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Tlaib (Kildee) | Vela (Gomez)    | Wilson (FL)   |
| Torres (NY)    | Velázquez       | (Hayes)       |
| (Auchincloss)  | (Jeffries)      | Wilson (SC)   |
| Van Drew       | Wasserman       | (Norman)      |
| (Norman)       | Schultz         | Young (Joyce) |
| Veasey         | (Deutch)        | (OH))         |
| (Fletcher)     | Waters (Takano) |               |

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the House majority whip the floor schedule for next week.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) my friend, the House majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman allowing me to stand in for the majority leader. I know he joins me in hoping that the majority leader will be back with us very shortly and that this will be his last time having to contend with me. I hope that Mr. HOYER will be rejoining us very soon, as he continues to mend.

Next week, the House will meet on Monday at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and at 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes expected no earlier than 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 11:30 for a pro forma session.

On Monday, we will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

In addition, we will consider:

H.R. 3005, legislation to remove the bust of former Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, Confederate statues, and certain other statues.

H.R. 2662, the Inspectors General Independence and Empowerment Act. This legislation is sorely needed in the wake of the prior administration's assault on the rule of law and independent oversight. It would strengthen the independence of inspectors general and protect their ability to investigate abuses at Federal agencies.

A resolution to establish a select committee to investigate the January 6 attack on the Capitol.

H.R. 3684 will be considered, the INVEST in America Act, to grow our economy and create good jobs by modernizing our Nation's roads, bridges, rail, and transit. In addition to addressing surface transportation, this bill will also include critical provisions to address our safe drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, as we look at some of the bills that are going to be coming to the floor next week, I

know there has been a lot of talk about infrastructure.

As we saw over these past few days, there is a bipartisan bill that is being worked through mostly in the Senate, where a number of Republicans and Democrats had seemed to reach an agreement on what would be considered traditional infrastructure without tax increases. It has now become a little more confused by a suggestion that maybe the Speaker has said it has to be tied to a budget reconciliation bill that would possibly raise taxes, which is surely not where we are. It doesn't seem to be where the bipartisan group in the Senate is.

I would ask the gentleman: Is there any expectation—because we don't have a budget that has moved through the House, and a budget would have to move first to create the ability for a budget reconciliation bill to move through the House or the Senate, if that even happened.

Is there expectation there would be a budget resolution coming to the floor in the upcoming weeks?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

## □ 1100

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have not consulted with the majority leader on that subject. I suspect that we will wait for the Senate's actions and make determinations as needed when we get some definition as to what they are going to do.

I understand that the gentleman indicates that what has occurred regarding the bipartisan legislation is of concern, but I assure the gentleman that the President made it very clear from the beginning that he has a definition of infrastructure that goes into family needs that are more or less nontraditional, and I think that all that the Speaker has been talking about is to reinforce her beliefs that the President is correct in his thoughts.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, for decades, we have never really had a disagreement on what infrastructure means. I think most Americans would recognize the definition that we have always gone by on a bipartisan basis, and it is roads and bridges, waterways and ports.

I think, recently, both sides would agree that broadband is something that we would include in that definition, but that is what always was the traditional definition of infrastructure by both parties.

It seems like on the majority side they are trying to change that definition to include a lot of extraneous things of which were not part of the Senate bipartisan agreement. But the other new addition seems to be this idea that a bill, a shell reconciliation bill to raise taxes, would now be something that would maybe hold hostage the rest of the bipartisan agreement.

I hope that is not the road we go down, especially considering there does